UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/645,880	08/25/2000	Megumi Yokoi	1614.1069	4079

21171 7590 08/25/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
TRAN, DENISE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2186	9

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/645,880	YOKOI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Denise Tran	2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 June 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 August 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

FINAL ACTION

1. The applicant's amendment filed 6/13/03 has been considered. Claims 1-11 and new added claims 12-34 are presented for examination.

2. Claims 18-34 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 1-17. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,067,611, hereinafter Carpenter in view of Irie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,263,405, hereinafter Irie.

As per claims 1 and 18, Carpenter shows the use of a memory access method for a multiprocessor system (e.g. fig. 1) which includes a plurality of system modules (e.g. fig. 1, elements 10a-10d) coupled via a crossbar module (e.g. fig. 1, element 22 and col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 1), each of the system modules including a buffer (e.g.

fig. 2C, element 52, col. 2, lines 46-60 and col. 11, lines 4-24) which holds data and a plurality of processors (e.g. fig. 1, CPUs) having a cache memory (e.g. fig. 1, elements L2 and col. 3, lines 40-45) which temporarily holds data, said memory access method comprising:

responsive to a read request from a processor within an arbitrary system module, holding data from a system module, other than the arbitrary system module (e.g. col. 2, lines 40-60).

Carpenter does not specifically show the use of a preread and a buffer within the crossbar to hold the data preread from a system module, other than the arbitrary system module. Irie shows the use of a preread and a buffer within the crossbar to hold the data preread from a system module, other than the arbitrary system module (e.g. fig. 9, parallel branches starting at steps 905 and 908 before judging based on the coherency status summary; col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 12 and col. 7, lines 44-50; fig. 1, element 40; fig. 6, element 400-2 and col. 10, lines 4-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Irie into Carpenter's system because it would provide for a reduction in memory latency when a cache miss occurs and allow the data to be in closer proximity to the requesting processor.

As per claims 5 and 22, Carpenter shows the use of a multiprocessor system, comprising:

a plurality of system modules (e.g. fig. 1, elements 10a-10d);

at least one crossbar module (e.g. fig. 1, element 22 and col. 4, lines 65 to col. 5, line 1); and

a bus coupling the system modules and crossbar module (e.g. fig. 2A, elements 28 and 32 and fig. 2C, elements "TO NODE INTERCONNECT ADDRESS PATH" and "TO NODE INTERCONNECT DATA PATH");

each of the system modules including a buffer which holds data (e.g. fig. 2C, element 52, col. 2, lines 46-60 and col. 11, lines 4-24), a plurality of processors (e.g. figure 1, CPUs) each having a cache memory which temporarily holds data (e.g. fig. 1, elements L2 and col. 3, lines 40-45), and a control unit which controls input and output of data with respect to the system module to which the control unit belongs (e.g. fig. 1, element 20 and fig. 2C);

a data transfer between two system modules being made via the crossbar module (e.g. fig. 1, element 22, and col. 5, lines 52-67); and

said crossbar module responsive to a read request from a processor within an arbitrary system module (e.g. abstract and col. 4, lines 65 to col. 5, line 1).

Carpenter does not specifically show the use of a preread and a buffer within the crossbar to hold the data preread from a system module, other than the arbitrary system module. Irie shows the use of a preread and a buffer within the crossbar to hold the data preread from a system module, other than the arbitrary system module (e.g. fig. 9, parallel branches starting at steps 905 and 908 before judging based on the coherency status summary; col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 12 and col. 7, lines 44-50; fig. 1, element 40; fig. 6, element 400-2 and col. 10, lines 4-5). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Irie into the system's Carpenter because it would provide for a reduction in memory latency when a cache miss occurs and allow the data to be in closer proximity to the requesting processor.

5. Claims 2, 6, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,067,611, hereinafter Carpenter, in view of Irie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,263,405, hereinafter Irie, as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and in further view of Christie, U.S. Patent No. 6,055,650.

As per claims 2, 6, 19 and 23, Carpenter and Irie do not specifically show the use of (unit) setting information indicating whether or not to carry out a data preread with respect to the arbitrary system module, depending on a program which is executed by one or a plurality of processors within the arbitrary system module. Christie shows the use of (unit) setting information indicating whether or not to carry out a data preread with respect to the arbitrary system module, depending on a program which is executed by one or a plurality of processors within the arbitrary system module (e.g. col. 2, lines 36-68 and col. 5, line 51 to col. 6, line 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Christie with the combined system of Carpenter and Irie because it would provide for an increase in performance by disabling accessing which are incorrect and reduce memory bandwidth conflicts, at taught by Christie, col. 2, lines 21-34.

6. Claims 4, 8, 12-15, 21, 25 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,067,611, hereinafter Carpenter in view of Irie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,263,405, hereinafter Irie, as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and in further view of Hooks et al., U.S. Patent No., 5,761,452, hereinafter Hooks.

As per claims 4, 8, 21 and 25, Carpenter and Irie do not specifically show the use of (unit) adding, to a data transfer of the preread data, a priority which in lower than a priority of a normal data transfer. Hooks shows the use of (unit) adding, to a data transfer of the preread data (i.e., speculative pre-fetch), a priority which in lower than a priority of a normal data transfer (e.g. col. 5, lines 17-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Hooks into the combined system of Carpenter and Irie because it would provide for the prevention of more important transactions from not being performed. Sometimes the preread will not be necessary if the data is in one of the caches. Therefore, it is obvious that a transaction that needs to be performed is more important than a transaction that might be performed as taught by Hooks, col. 1, lines 53-62.

As per claims 12, 14, 29 and 31, Carpenter does not specifically show the use of generating the read request from the arbitrary system module if a mishit occurs in the arbitrary system module, prereading the data requested by the read request in the system module, other than the arbitrary system module, and storing the requested data, and transferring the preread data from the system module, other than the arbitrary

system module, to the buffer within the crossbar module, with a priority lower than a priority of a normal data transfer between the system modules and the crossbar module. Irie shows the use of generating the read request from the arbitrary system module if a mishit occurs in the arbitrary system module (e.g. col. 6, lines 51-54 or col. 7, lines 21-25), prereading the data requested by the read request in the system module, other than the arbitrary system module, and storing the requested data, and transferring the preread data from the system module, other than the arbitrary system module, to the buffer within the crossbar module (e.g. col. 6, line 54 to col. 7, line 12 or col. 7, lines 25-35 and col. 10, lines 3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Irie into the system's Carpenter because it would provide for a reduction in memory latency when a cache miss occurs and allow the data to be in closer proximity to the requesting processor. Hooks shows the use of adding, to a data transfer of the preread data (i.e., speculative pre-fetch), a priority which in lower than a priority of a normal data transfer (e.g. col. 5, lines 17-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Hooks into the combined system of Carpenter and Irie because it would provide for the prevention of more important transactions from not being performed. Sometimes the preread will not be necessary if the data is in one of the caches. Therefore, it is obvious that a transaction that needs to be performed is more important than a transaction that might be performed as taught by Hooks, col. 1, lines 53-62.

As per claims 13, 15, 30 and 32, Carpenter does not specifically show the use of transferring the preread data stored in the buffer within the crossbar module to the arbitrary system module. Irie shows the use of transferring the preread data stored in the buffer within the crossbar module to the arbitrary system module (e.g. col. 7, lines 6-8 or 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Irie into the system's Carpenter because it would provide for a reduction in memory latency when a cache miss occurs and allow the data to be in closer proximity to the requesting processor to be received. Furthermore, Carpenter and Irie do not specifically show the use of adding, to a data transfer of the preread data, a priority which in lower than a priority of a normal data transfer. Hooks shows the use of adding, to a data transfer of the preread data (i.e., speculative pre-fetch), a priority which in lower than a priority of a normal data transfer (e.g. col. 5, lines 17-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Hooks into the combined system of Carpenter and Irie because it would provide for the prevention of more important transactions from not being performed. Sometimes the preread will not be necessary if the data is in one of the caches. Therefore, it is obvious that a transaction that needs to be performed is more important than a transaction that might be performed as taught by Hooks, col. 1, lines 53-62.

7. Claims 3, 7, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,067,611, hereinafter Carpenter in

view of Irie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,263,405, hereinafter Irie, as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, in further view of Christie, U.S. Patent No. 6,055,650 and in further view of Hooks et al., U.S. Patent No., 5,761,452, hereinafter Hooks.

As per claims 3, 7, 20 and 24, Carpenter, Irie and Christie do not specifically show the use of (unit) adding, to a data transfer of the preread data, a priority which in lower than a priority of a normal data transfer. Hooks shows the use of (unit) adding, to a data transfer of the preread data (i.e., speculative pre-fetch), a priority which in lower than a priority of a normal data transfer (e.g. col. 5, lines 17-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Hooks into the combined system of Carpenter, Irie and Christie because it would provide for the prevention of more important transactions from not being performed. Sometimes the preread will not be necessary if the data is in one of the caches. Therefore, it is obvious that a transaction that needs to be performed is more important than a transaction that might be performed as taught by Hooks, col. 1, lines 53-62.

8. Claims 9 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,067,611, hereinafter Carpenter in view of Irie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,263,405, hereinafter Irie , as applied to claim 5 above, and in further view of Pong, U.S. Patent No. 6,341,337.

As per claims 9 and 26, Carpenter and Irie do not specifically show the use of wherein one of the system modules, which has a memory with a requested address of

the read request, includes unit starting a data preread at a timing before detecting a state of the cache memory included therein. Pong shows the use of wherein one of the system modules, which has a memory with a requested address of the read request, includes a unit starting a data preread at a timing before detecting a state of the cache memory included therein (e.g. fig. 6, branch of elements starting with 302 and 312 and col. 7, lines 25-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Pong into the combined system of Carpenter and Irie because it would provide for the distributed control of the preread and a reduction in bus traffic as taught by Pong col. 4, lines 9-11.

9. Claims 10-11 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,067,611, hereinafter Carpenter in view of Irie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,263,405, hereinafter Irie and in further view of Venkitakrishnan, U.S. Patent No. 6,263,415.

As per claims 10, 11 and 27-28, Carpenter shows the use of a multiprocessor system comprising:

a plurality of nodes (e.g. figure 1, elements 10a-10d) each including a system module (e.g. figure 1, elements 10a-10d), a bus coupling the system modules and the crossbar module (e.g. figure 2A, elements 28 and 32 and figure 2C, elements "TO NODE INTERCONNECT ADDRESS PATH" and "TO NODE INTERCONNECT DATA PATH"); and

each of the system modules including a buffer which holds data (e.g. figure 2C, element 52, col. 2, lines 46-60 and col. 11, lines 4-24), a plurality of processors (e.g. fig. 1, CPUs) each having a cache memory which temporarily holds data (e.g. figure 1, elements L2 and col. 3, lines 40-45) and a control unit which controls input and output of data with respect to the system module to which the control unit belongs (e.g. figure 1, element 20 and figure 2C),

a data transfer between two system modules being made via at least one crossbar module (e.g. figure 1, element 22, and col. 5, lines 52-67), and

said crossbar module responsive to a read request from a processor within an arbitrary system module (e.g. abstract and col. 4, lines 65 to col. 5, line 1).

Carpenter does not specifically show the use of the node having a plurality of system modules and a crossbar, a bus coupling adjacent nodes via the crossbar modules of the adjacent node, a preread and a buffer within the crossbar to hold the data preread from a system module, other than the arbitrary system module. Irie shows the use of a preread and a buffer within the crossbar to hold the data preread from a system module, other than the arbitrary system module (e.g. fig. 9, parallel branches starting at steps 905 and 908 before judging based on the coherency status summary; col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 12 and col. 7, lines 44-50; fig. 1, element 40; fig. 6, element 400-2 and col. 10, lines 4-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Irie into the system's Carpenter because it would provide for a reduction in memory latency when a cache miss occurs and allow the data to be in closer proximity to the requesting processor.

Venkitakrishnan shows the use of the node having a plurality of system modules (e.g. fig. 1, elements 200+300 and 400+500) and a crossbar (e.g. fig. 1, element 600 and 700), a bus coupling adjacent nodes via the crossbar modules of the adjacent node (e.g. fig. 1, connections between XBS). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Venkitakrishnan into the combined system of Carpenter and Irie because it would provide for a reduction of signal lines between crossbars (i.e., sharing a crossbar between two system modules) and provide for the ease of expandability of the system (i.e., adding nodes without having to replace the central crossbar switch).

10. Claims 16, 17, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,067,611, hereinafter Carpenter in view of Irie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,263,405, hereinafter Irie and in further view of Venkitakrishnan, U.S. Patent No. 6,263,415 and Hooks et al., U.S. Patent No., 5,761,452, hereinafter Hooks.

As per claims 16 and 33, Carpenter does not specifically show the use of generating the read request from the arbitrary system module if a mishit occurs in the arbitrary system module, prereading the data requested by the read request in the system module, other than the arbitrary system module, and storing the requested data, and transferring the preread data from the system module, other than the arbitrary system module, to the buffer within the crossbar module, with a priority lower than a priority of a normal data transfer between the system modules and the crossbar module.

Irie shows the use of generating the read request from the arbitrary system module if a mishit occurs in the arbitrary system module (e.g. col. 6, lines 51-54 or col. 7, lines 21-25), prereading the data requested by the read request in the system module, other than the arbitrary system module, and storing the requested data, and transferring the preread data from the system module, other than the arbitrary system module, to the buffer within the crossbar module (e.g. col. 6, line 54 to col. 7, line 12 or col. 7, lines 25-35 and col. 10, lines 3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Irie into the system's Carpenter because it would provide for a reduction in memory latency when a cache miss occurs and allow the data to be in closer proximity to the requesting processor. Hooks shows the use of adding, to a data transfer of the preread data (i.e., speculative pre-fetch), a priority which in lower than a priority of a normal data transfer (e.g. col. 5, lines 17-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Hooks into the combined system of Carpenter and Irie because it would provide for the prevention of more important transactions from not being performed. Sometimes the preread will not be necessary if the data is in one of the caches. Therefore, it is obvious that a transaction that needs to be performed is more important than a transaction that might be performed as taught by Hooks, col. 1, lines 53-62.

As per claims 17 and 34, Carpenter does not specifically show the use of transferring the preread data stored in the buffer within the crossbar module to the

arbitrary system module. Irie shows the use of transferring the preread data stored in the buffer within the crossbar module to the arbitrary system module (e.g. col. 7, lines 6-8 or 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Irie into the system's Carpenter because it would provide for a reduction in memory latency when a cache miss occurs and allow the data to be in closer proximity to the requesting processor to be received. Furthermore, Carpenter and Irie do not specifically show the use of adding, to a data transfer of the preread data, a priority which in lower than a priority of a normal data transfer. Hooks shows the use of adding, to a data transfer of the preread data (i.e., speculative pre-fetch), a priority which in lower than a priority of a normal data transfer (e.g. col. 5, lines 17-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Hooks into the combined system of Carpenter and Irie because it would provide for the prevention of more important transactions from not being performed. Sometimes the preread will not be necessary if the data is in one of the caches. Therefore, it is obvious that a transaction that needs to be performed is more important than a transaction that might be performed as taught by Hooks, col. 1, lines 53-62.

11. Applicant's arguments filed 6/13/03 have been considered but are not persuasive.

12. In the remarks, Applicants argued in substance that (1) Irie et al. does not show the use of a buffer with a crossbar module to hold data preread from a system module other than an arbitrary system module.

As to point (1) the examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated above, Irie shows the use of a preread and a buffer within the crossbar to hold the data preread from a system module, other than the arbitrary system module (e.g. fig. 9, parallel branches starting at steps 905 and 908 before judging based on the coherency status summary; col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 12 and col. 7, lines 44-50; fig. 1, element 40; fig. 6, element 400-2 and col. 10, lines 4-5). Based on Applicant's specification the phrase "preread" has been interpreted by the examiner as issuing simultaneous requests to different memories for the same data. The examiner's interpretation is based on Applicant's specifcation page 1, lines 21-28, which states "In a conventional processor system, when a read request is output from one processor, a **data preread access is started** with respect to the main memory, **simultaneously as an access to a cache memory** of this one processor. When the access to the cache memory results in a mishit, the data read from the main memory to a buffer by the data preread access can be used to reduce the memory access time." Therefore, as shown in Irie (e.g. fig. 9, parallel branches starting at steps 905 and 908 before judging based on the coherency status summary; col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 12 and col. 7, lines 20-50) the crossbar unit multicasts (i.e., simultaneous access to cache memories and main memory 61) the transaction to all of the processor boards and specified memory boards and when a hit is determined in cache 12 of one of the processor boards the data transfer from main

memory is suppressed (i.e., the simultaneous accesses occurs before the determination of the hit in cache 12) (e.g. col. 7, lines 20-50). As per the buffer within the crossbar to hold the data preread from a system module, other than the arbitrary system module, Irie clearly shows the data preread being transferred and held (i.e., stored) in the buffer within the crossbar unit (e.g. col. 7, lines 3-6 or lines 33-35 and col. 10, lines 3-5 and figure 6, elements 400). Therefore Irie shows the use of data preread and a buffer within the crossbar to hold the data preread from a system module, other than the arbitrary system module.

13. In the remarks, Applicants argued in substance that (2) Christie does not teach or suggest the use of a preread and a buffer within the crossbar module to hold the data preread from a system module other than the arbitrary system module, as recited in base claims 1 and 5.

As to point (2) in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Christie was not relied upon to show the above limitations, Irie was. As shown in the examiner's response to Applicant's argument (1), Irie does show the above limitations.

14. In the remarks, Applicants argued in substance that (3) Hooks does not teach or suggest the use of a preread and a buffer within the crossbar module to hold the data preread from a system module other than the arbitrary system module, as recited in base claims 1 and 5.

As to point (3) in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Hooks was not relied upon to show the above limitations, Irie was. As shown in the examiner's response to Applicant's argument (1), Irie does show the above limitations.

15. In the remarks, Applicants argued in substance that (4) Pong does not teach or suggest the use of a preread and a buffer within the crossbar module to hold the data preread from a system module other than the arbitrary system module, as recited in base claim 5.

As to point (4) in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Pong was not relied upon to show the above limitations,

Irie was. As shown in the examiner's response to Applicant's argument (1), Irie does show the above limitations.

16. In the remarks, Applicants argued in substance that (5) Venkitakrishnan does not teach or suggest the use of a preread and a buffer within the crossbar module to hold the data preread from a system module other than the arbitrary system module, as recited in base claim 5.

As to point (5) in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Venkitakrishnan was not relied upon to show the above limitations, Irie was. As shown in the examiner's response to Applicant's argument (1), Irie does show the above limitations.

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Denise Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-9823. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Thursday and an alternated Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on (703) 305-3821. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for central Official communications and (703) 746-7240 for Non Official communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Denise Tran

D.T.
August 24, 2003